THE MYSTERIES OF The Christian Faith *ASSERTED* and *VINDICATED:* IN A SERMON

Preached at

S. Laurence-Jewry *in* London,

APRIL the 7th. 1691.

By the Right Reverend Father in GOD, *EDWARD* Lord Bishop of *Worcester.*

The Second Edition.

LONDON,
Printed by *J. H.* for *Henry Mortlock* at the *Phœnix* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. 1691.

THE

MYSTERIES

OF

the Christian Faith

ASSERTED and VINDICATED:

IN A

SERMON

Preached at

St. Laurence-Jewry in London,

APRIL the 7th 1691.

By the Right Reverend Father in GOD,

EDWARD Lord Bishop of Worcester.

LONDON

Printed by J. H. for Henry Mortlock at the Phenix in St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1691.

A SERMON

Preached at

S. Laurence-Jewry,

APRIL the 7th. 1691.

1 TIM. I. 15.

This is a faithfull saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the World to save Sinners, of whom I am chief.

IF these Words were to be understood without any Restriction or Limitation *that Christ Jesus came into the World to save sinners*, they would overthrow the great Design of the Gospel, and make its Excellent Precepts Useless and Ineffectual. For, to what purpose should men be put upon the severe Practice of Repentance, Mortification and a continued Course of a Holy Life, if the meer being *Sinners* did sufficiently qualifie them for Salvation? This indeed would be thought a Doctrine *worthy of all Acceptation* by the *greatest Sinners*; but

it could not be *a faithfull ſaying*, being not agreeable either to the Nature of God, or Revelation of his Will by *Chriſt Jeſus*. But S. *Paul* ſpeaks of ſuch *Sinners* as himſelf had been; *i. e.* ſuch as had been great Sinners, but had truly and ſincerely repented. *Of whom I am chief.* What then? Muſt we look on him as the Standard and Meaſure of ſuch *Sinners* whom *Chriſt Jeſus* came to ſave? What will then become of all thoſe who have been Sinners of a higher Rank than ever he was? It's true in the Verſes before the Text, he ſets out his Sins, as a humble Penitent is wont to do, with the worſt
Ver. 13. Colours and deepeſt Aggravations, *Who was before a blaſphemer and a perſecutor, and injurious*; but yet he adds, *that he obtained Mercy becauſe he did it ignorantly, in unbelief.* How then is S. *Paul* the *Chief of Sinners*? Are Sins of *Ignorance* and *Miſtake* the greateſt of Sins, for which Chriſt died? Is there no *Expiation* for any other by *Jeſus Chriſt*? What will become then of all ſuch who ſin againſt Knowledge and Conſcience, and not *in Ignorance and Unbelief*? Can none of theſe hope for Mercy by *Chriſt Jeſus*, although they do truly Repent? But *the*
1 Joh. 1. 7. *Blood of Chriſt* is ſaid elſewhere *to cleanſe us from all Sin*; not, while we continue in them, but if we
Ch. 2. v. 2. repent and forſake them. And *Jeſus Chriſt* is ſaid *to be a Propitiation for our Sins; and not for ours only, but for the Sins of the whole World.* And there-

fore

fore this Expreſſion of S. *Paul* notes his great Humility and deep Senſe of his own Sins; but doth not exclude others from the hopes of Pardon whoſe Sins have other Aggravations than his had. For, if we leave out the laſt words as peculiar to his Caſe, yet the other contain in them a true Propoſition and of the greateſt Importance to Mankind; *This is a faithful ſaying and worthy of all acceptation, that Chriſt Jeſus came into the World to ſave ſinners.*

This, you may ſay, is a matter out of all doubt among all ſuch who hope for Salvation by *Chriſt Jeſus*; for all are agreed, that one way or other we are to be *ſaved by him.* But there is great Difficulty as to the Way of *ſaving ſinners* by *Chriſt Jeſus*; whether by *the Doctrine and Example of the Man Chriſt Jeſus*; *by the Power he attained through his Sufferings*; Or, *by the Eternal Son of God's aſſuming our Nature, and ſuffering in our ſtead in order to the Reconciling God to us and making a Propitiation for our Sins.* Theſe are two very different *Hypotheſes* or Notions of *Chriſt's coming to ſave Sinners* and the former ſeems more Eaſie to be underſtood and believed; and the other ſeems to have Inſuperable Difficulties in point of Reaſon; and to run our Religion into *Myſteries*, which expoſe our Faith and make Chriſtianity appear Contemptible to Men of Senſe and Underſtanding. Is it not therefore much better to embrace ſuch a Scheme of it,

as

as will have the least Objection against it, that so Men of Reason may not be tempted to Infidelity, and Men of Superstition may not under the Colour of *Mysteries* bring in the most Absurd and Unreasonable Doctrines?

These are plausible Insinuations, and would be apt to prevail on considering Mens minds, if they were to form and make a Religion that might be most accommodated to the *Genius* and *Humour* of the Age they live in. And truly no Men (by their own Authority) can pretend to a Right to impose on others any *Mysteries of Faith*, or any such things which are above their Capacity to understand. But that is not our Case; for we all profess to believe and receive *Christianity* as a *Divine Revelation*; and God (we say) may require from us the belief of what we may not be able to comprehend, especially if it relates to Himself, or such things which are Consequent upon the Union of the Divine and Human Nature. Therefore our business is to consider, whether any such things be contained in that *Revelation* which we all own; and if they be, we are bound to believe them, although we are not able to comprehend them.

Now here are two Remarkable *Characters* in these Words, by which we may examin these different *Hypotheses* concerning the way of *Salvation by Jesus Christ*.

I. *It is a faithfull saying*, and therefore must be contained in that Revelation which God hath made concerning our Salvation by Christ.

II. *It is worthy of all Acceptation*; *i. e.* most usefull and beneficial to Mankind.

Now by these two I shall proceed in the Examination of them.

I. Which is most agreeable to the Revealed Will of God.

II. Which doth offer fairest for the Benefit and Advantage of Mankind.

I. Which is most agreeable to the Revealed Will of God. For that we are sure is the most *faithfull saying*; since Men of Wit and Reason may deceive us, but God cannot. When the Apostles first preached this Doctrine to the World, they were not bound to believe what they affirmed to be *a faithfull saying* till they gave sufficient Evidence of their Authority from God, by the wonderfull Assistance of the Holy Ghost. But now this *faithfull saying* is contained in the Books of the *New Testament*, by which we are to judge of the Truth of all *Christian* Doctrines. And when two different Senses of Places of Scripture are offer'd, we are to consider, which is most Reasonable to be preferr'd. And herein we are allow'd to Exercise

out Reason as much as we please; and the more we do so, the sooner we shall come to Satisfaction in this matter.

Now according to Reason we may judge that Sense to be preferr'd,

(1.) Which is most plain and easie and agreeable to the most received Sense of Words; not that which is forced and intricate, or which puts improper and *metaphorical* Senses upon Words which are commonly taken in other Senses; especially when it is no Sacramental thing, which in its own Nature is Figurative.

(2.) That which suits most with the Scope and Design not only of the particular Places, but of the whole *New Testament*; which is, to magnifie God and to depress Man; to set forth the Infinite Love and Condescension of God *in giving his Son to be a Propitiation for our Sins*; to set up the Worship of one *true God* in Opposition to *Creatures*; to Represent and Declare the mighty Advantages Mankind receive by the *Sufferings* of *Christ Jesus*.

(3.) That which hath been generally received in the *Christian Church* to be the Sense of those places. For, we are certain, this was always look'd on as a matter of great Concernment to all Christians; and they had as great Capacity of understanding the Sense of the Apostles; and the Primitive Church had greater Helps for knowing it than

than others at ſo much greater Diſtance. And therefore the Senſe is not to be taken from modern *Inventions*, or *Criticiſms*, or pretences to *Revelation*; but that which was at firſt deliver'd to the *Chriſtian Church* and hath been ſince received and embraced by it in the ſeveral Ages; and hath been moſt ſtrenuouſly aſſerted, when it hath met with Oppoſition, as founded on *Scripture* and the *general Conſent* of the *Chriſtian Church*.

(4.) That which beſt agrees with the *Characters* of thoſe Perſons from whom we receive the Chriſtian Faith; and thoſe are *Chriſt Jeſus* and his *holy Apoſtles*. For, if their *Authority* be loſt, our Religion is gone; and their Authority depends upon their *Sincerity* and *Faithfulneſs*, and care to inform the World aright in matters of ſo great Importance.

(1.) I begin with the Character which the Apoſtles give of *Chriſt Jeſus* himſelf; which is, that he was a Perſon of the greateſt Humility and Condeſcention, that he did not aſſume to himſelf that which he might juſtly have done. For let the Words of S. *Paul* be underſtood either as to the *Nature*, or *Dignity* of Chriſt, it is certain that they muſt imply thus much, that when *Chriſt Jeſus* was here on Earth, he was not of a vain aſſuming humour, that he did not boaſt of himſelf, nor magnifie his own Greatneſs, but was contented to be

look'd on as other Men; although he had at that time far greater and Diviner Excellency in him than the World would believe. Leſs than this, cannot be made of thoſe Words of the Apoſtle,

Phil. 2. 6, 7. *Who being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himſelf of no Reputation and took upon him the form of a Servant.*

Now this being the *Character* given of him let us conſider what he doth affirm concerning himſelf. For although he was far from drawing the People after him, by ſetting forth his own Perfections; yet upon juſt Occaſions, when the *Jews* conteſted with him, he did Aſſert ſuch things, which muſt ſavour of Vanity and Oſtentation, or elſe muſt imply that he was the *Eternal Son* of *God*. For, all Mankind are agreed that the higheſt degree of Ambition lies in Affecting Divine Honour, or for a meer Man to be thought a *God*. How ſeverely did God puniſh *Herod* for being pleaſed with the Peoples folly in crying out, *The Voice of*

Act. 12. 22. *God and not of Man*? And therefore he could never have born with ſuch poſitive Aſſertions and ſuch repeated Defences of his being *the Son of God* in ſuch a manner as implied his being ſo from

Joh. 6. 32, 33. Eternity. This in his Diſputes with the *Jews* he Affirms ſeveral times, *that he came down from Hea-*

38. 50. 38. 62. *ven*, not in a *Metaphorical* but in a proper Senſe; as appears by thoſe words, *What and if ye ſhall ſee*

the

the Son of Man aſcend up where he was before? In another *Conference* he aſſerted, *that he was before Abraham.* Which the *Jews* ſo literally underſtood, that without a *Metaphor they went about to ſtone him*; little imagining that by *Abraham* the calling of the *Gentiles* was to be underſtood. But above all, is that Expreſſion which he uſed to the *Jews* at another Conference, *I and my Father are one*; which they underſtood in ſuch a manner that immediately *they took up ſtones to have ſtoned him.* What means all this Rage of the *Jews* againſt him? What? for ſaying, *that he had Unity of Conſent with his Father?* No certainly. *But the Jews miſunderſtood him.* Let us ſuppoſe it; would not our *Saviour* have immediately explained himſelf to prevent ſo dangerous a Miſconſtruction? But he asked them, what it was they ſtoned him for? They Anſwer him directly and plainly, *becauſe that thou being a Man makeſt thy ſelf God.* This was home to the purpoſe. And here was the time for him to have denied it, if it had not been ſo. But doth he deny it? Doth he ſay, it would be *Blaſphemy* in him to own it? No; but he goes about to defend it; and proves it to be no *Blaſphemy for him to ſay that he was the Son of God*; *i. e.* ſo *as to be God*, as the *Jews* underſtood it. Can we imagin that a *meer Man* knowing himſelf to be ſuch, ſhould Aſſume this to himſelf; and yet *God* to bear witneſs to

Joh. 8. 58.
v. 59.
Joh. 10. 30.
v. 31.
v. 32, 33.
v. 36.

him not only by *Miracles* but by a *Voice from Hea-*
Mat. 3. 17. *ven*, wherein he was called his *beloved Son in whom he was well pleaſed?* Could God be pleaſed with a mortal, finite, deſpicable Creature, as the *Jews* thought him, that Aſſumed to himſelf to be *God* and maintained and defended it among his own People, in a ſolemn *Conference* at a very Publick Place in one of the *Portico's* of the Temple? And this he perſiſted in to the laſt. For, when *the*
Matt. 26. 63. *High Prieſt adjured him by the living God to tell, whether he were the Chriſt the Son of God,* (for he, no doubt, had heard of the *Reſult* of this *Conference*
v. 64. in *Solomon's Porch*) *Jeſus ſaid unto him, Thou haſt*
Mark 14. 62. *ſaid.* S. *Mark*, more expreſly, *Jeſus ſaid I am.* And this was the *Blaſphemy*, for which they put him to
v. 64 death; as appears by the *Evangeliſts.* So that this
Matt. 26. 66. ought to be a Diſpute only between *Jews* and *Chriſtians*; ſince it was the very point, for which they condemned him to death. And in his laſt moſt divine Prayer juſt before his Suffering, he owns
Luk. 22. 71. the *Glory* which he had *with the Father* before the
Joh. 17. 5. World had a being. *And now, O Father, glorifie thou me with the glory which I had with thee, before the World was.* Was this nothing but the *Glory* which *God* had deſigned to give him? This is ſo far from being peculiar to Chriſt, that it is common to all whom *God* deſigns to glorifie; and takes away the diſtinction between the *Decree* and the *Execution* of it.

(2.) As

(2.) As to the *Apoſtles*, the Reaſon we believe their Teſtimony is, that they were Men of great Sincerity and Plainneſs, and of great Zeal for the Honour and Glory of God. And according to this *Character*, let us examin what they ſay concerning *Chriſt Jeſus*.

He that was moſt converſant with him, and beloved by him, and lived to ſee his *Divinity* conteſted by ſome, and denied by others, is moſt ample in ſetting it forth in his Admirable, Sublime, and Divine Introduction to his Goſpel. Which all the Wit of Mankind can never make tolerable Senſe of, if they deny *Chriſt*'s being the *Eternal Son of God*; and it is he, that hath preſerved thoſe *Conferences* with the *Jews*, wherein he aſſerts his own *Divinity*. Joh. 1.1,2. &c.

S. *Paul* was a Stranger to him while he lived; but at the ſame time when he was ſo zealous to perſwade the *Gentiles* to the *Worſhip* of *God* and not of *Creatures*, he calls him *God*, *over all bleſſed for evermore*. And when he ſaith, that *the Eternal Power and Godhead are known by the Creation of the World*, he attributes *the Creation of all things* to *Chriſt*, applying to him thoſe words of the *Pſalmiſt*, *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth and the Heaven, the Work of thy hands*. Which cannot be underſtood of any *Metaphorical Creation*. Rom. 9.5. Rom. 1.20 Col. 1.16. Heb. 1. 2, 10.

And

And after the ſtricteſt Examination of Copies, thoſe will be found the beſt, which have that Reading on which our Tranſlation is grounded. 1 Tim. 3. 16. *And without Controverſie great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs, God was manifeſt in the Fleſh.* So that *God's being manifeſt in the Fleſh* is made a great Part of the *Myſtery* of *Chriſtianity*.

But here ariſes a Difficulty, which deſerves to be conſider'd; *i. e.* "If there were nothing in the "Chriſtian Doctrine, but the Way of *Saving ſin-*"*ners* by the Doctrine and Example of Chriſt, "there would be little Objection to be made to "it; ſince the obtaining Eternal Life is certainly "the beſt thing can be propoſed to Mankind, and "the Precepts of Chriſt are Divine and Spiritual, "Plain and Eaſie to be Underſtood, and Agree-"able to the Reaſon of Mankind; but many "other things are impoſed on Men as neceſſary "to be believed concerning *Chriſt Jeſus*, as to his "*Divinity*, *Incarnation*, and the *Hypoſtatical Union* of "both Natures, which perplex and confound our "Underſtandings; and yet theſe things are not "only deliver'd as *Myſteries* of *the Chriſtian Faith*; "but the Belief of them is required as neceſſary to "the Salvation of Sinners; whereas, if they are "Revealed they are no longer *Myſteries*; and if they "are not Revealed, how come they to be made "Articles of Faith? The Scripture knows of no other

" other *Myſteries of Faith* but ſuch as were hidden
" before the Revelation of them, but ſince they are
" Revealed they are plain and open to all mens
" Capacities; and therefore it is a great Injury to
" the Plainneſs and Simplicity of the Goſpel to im-
" poſe ſuch incomprehenſible Myſteries, as Neceſ-
" ſary Articles of Faith; and it is Abuſing the Cre-
" dulity of Mankind, to make ſuch things neceſ-
" ſary to be believed, which are impoſſible to be
" underſtood. But thoſe who have ever loved to
" Deceive and Abuſe the reſt of the World, have
" been always fond of the Name of *Myſteries*;
" and therefore all ſuch things are to be ſuſpected,
" which come under that Name. For, all ſuch
" Points which will not bear Examination, muſt
" be wrapt up and Reverenced under the Name of
" *Myſteries*, that is, of things to be ſwallow'd with-
" out being underſtood. *But the Scripture never*
" *calls that a Myſtery which is Incomprehenſible in it*
" *ſelfs though never ſo much revealed.*

Diſcourſe of the Word Myſtery, &c. p. 5.

This is the main force of the Objection, which I ſhall endeavour to remove by ſhewing,

(1.) That God may juſtly require from us in general, the Belief of what we cannot comprehend.

(2.) That which way ſoever the Way of Salvation by *Chriſt* be explained, there will be ſomething of that Nature found in it; and

and that thoſe who reject the Myſteries of Faith run into greater Difficulties than thoſe who aſſert them.

(3.) That no more is required as a Neceſſary Article of Faith than what is plainly and clearly Revealed.

(1.) That God may juſtly require from us in general, the Belief of what we cannot comprehend. It is to very little purpoſe to enquire whether the Word *Myſtery* in *Scripture* be applied to ſuch particular Doctrines, whoſe Subſtance is Revealed, but the manner of them is incomprehenſible by us; for why may not we make uſe of ſuch a Word whereby to expreſs things truely revealed, but above our Comprehenſion? We are certain the Word *Myſtery* is uſed for things far leſs difficult and abſtruſe; and why may it not then be fitly applied to ſuch matters, which are founded on Divine Revelation, but yet are too deep for us to go to the bottom of them? Are there not *Myſteries* in Arts, *Myſteries* in Nature, *Myſteries* in Providence? And what Abſurdity is there to call thoſe *Myſteries*, which in ſome Meaſure are known, but in much greater unknown to us? Although therefore in the Language of Scripture it be granted, that the word *Myſtery* is moſt frequently applied, *to things before hidden, but now revealed*, yet there is no Incongruity in calling that a *Myſtery*; which being revealed,

revealed, hath yet ſomething in it which our underſtandings cannot reach to. But it is meer Cavilling to inſiſt on a Word, if the Thing it ſelf be granted. The chief thing therefore to be done is, to ſhew that God may require from us the belief of ſuch things which are incomprehenſible by us. For, *God* may require any thing from us, which it is reaſonable for us to do; if it be then reaſonable for us to give Aſſent where the manner of what *God* hath revealed is not comprehended, then *God* may certainly require it from us. Hath not God revealed to us that *in ſix days he made Heaven and Earth and all that is therein?* But is it not reaſonable for us to believe this, unleſs we are able to comprehend the manner of *God*'s production of things? Here we have ſomething revealed and that plainly enough, *viz.* that *God created all things*, and yet, here is a *Myſtery* remaining as to the manner of doing it. Hath not God plainly revealed that there ſhall be a *Reſurrection* of the dead? and muſt we think it unreaſonable to believe it, till we are able to comprehend all the changes of the Particles of Matter from the *Creation* to the General *Reſurrection?* But it is ſaid *that there is no Contradiction in this, but there is in the Myſtery of the Trinity and Incarnation.* It is ſtrange Boldneſs in Men to talk thus of *Monſtrous Contradictions* in things above their Reach. The *Atheiſts* may as well ſay, *Infinite Power* is

Obſervations on Dr. Wallis his four Letters, p. 4.

is a *Monſtrous Contradiction*; and *God's Immenſity* and his other unſearchable Perfections are *Monſtrous Paradoxes* and *Contradictions*. Will Men never learn to diſtinguiſh between *Numbers* and the Nature of *Things*? For *three* to be *one* is a *Contradiction* in *Numbers*; but whether an Infinite Nature can communicate it ſelf to three *different Subſiſtences* without ſuch a *Diviſion* as is among Created Beings, muſt not be determin'd by bare *Numbers*, but by the Abſolute *Perfections* of the Divine Nature; which muſt be owned to be above our Comprehenſion.

For let us examin ſome of thoſe *Perfections* which are moſt clearly revealed and we ſhall find this true. The *Scripture* plainly reveals, that *God* is from *everlaſting to everlaſting*; *that he was and is and is to come*; but ſhall we not believe the Truth of this till we are able to fathom the *Abyſs* of God's *Eternity*? I am apt to think (and I have ſome thoughtfull Men concurring with me) that there is no greater Difficulty in the Conception of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, than there is of *Eternity*. Not but that there is great Reaſon to believe it; but from hence it appears that our Reaſon may oblige us to believe ſome things which it is not poſſible for us to comprehend. We know that either God muſt have been for ever, or it is impoſſible he ever ſhould be; for if he ſhould come into Being when he was not, he muſt have ſome Cauſe of his Being;

Pſal. 90.2. Revel. 1.4. c.11. v.17.

Biſterfield c. Grell. p. 50.

Petav. de Trin. l. 3. c. 9. §. 15.

Being; and that which was the first Cause would be God. But, if he was for ever he must be from himself; and what Notion or Conception can we have in our Minds concerning it? And yet, *Atheistical* Men can take no Advantage from hence; because their own most absurd *Hypothesis* hath the very same Difficulty in it. For something must have been for ever. And it is far more Reasonable to suppose it of an Infinite and Eternal Mind, which hath Wisdom and Power and Goodness to give Being to other things, than of dull, stupid and senseless Matter, which could never move it self, nor give Being to any thing besides. Here we have therefore a thing which must be owned by all; and yet such a thing which can be conceived by none. Which shews the narrowness and shortness of our Understandings, and how unfit they are to be the Measures of the Possibilities of things. *Vain Men would be Wise*; they would fain go to the very bottom of things, when alas! they scarce understand the very Surface of them. They will allow no *Mysteries* in Religion; and yet every thing is a *Mystery* to them. They cry out of *Cheats* and *Impostures* under the Notion of *Mysteries*; and yet there is not a Spire of Grass but is a *Mystery* to them; they will bear with nothing in *Religion* which they cannot comprehend, and yet there is scarce any thing in the World which they can compre-

hend. But above other things the *Divine Perfections*, even those which are most Absolute and Necessary are above their Reach. For let such Men try their Imaginations about God's *Eternity*, not meerly how he should be from himself, but how God should coexist with all the Differences of Times and yet there be no Succession in his own Being. I do not say there is such Difficulty to conceive a Rock standing still when the Waves run by it; or the *Gnomon* of a Dial when the Shadow passes from one Figure to another; because these are gross unactive things; but the Difficulty is far greater where the Being is Perfect and always Active. For, where there is Succession there is a passing out of not being in such a duration into being in it; which is not consistent with the Absolute Perfection of the Divine Nature. And therefore God must be all at once what he is, without any Respect to the Difference of Time past, present or to come. From whence *Eternity* was defined by *Boethius* to *be a perfect and complete Possession all at once of everlasting Life*. But how can we form any Conception in our Minds of that being all at once, which hath such different Acts as must be measur'd by a long Succession of Time? As, the Creating and Dissolving the Frame of the World; the Promising and Sending the *Messias*; the Declaring and Executing a general Judgment; how can these things be consistent

De Consol. l. 3.

ſiſtent with a Permanent Inſtant, or a Continuance of being without Succeſſion? For, it is impoſſible for us in this Caſe, as to God's Eternity, to form a clear and diſtinct *Idea* in our Mind, of that which both *Reaſon* and *Revelation* convince us muſt be. The moſt we can make of our Conception of it is, that God hath neither Beginning of Being, nor End of Days; but that he always was and always muſt be. And this is rather a neceſſary Concluſion from Reaſon and Scripture, than any diſtinct Notion or Conception of Eternity in our Minds. From whence it evidently follows, that God may reveal ſomething to us, which we are bound to believe, and yet after that Revelation the Manner of it may be incomprehenſible by us, and conſequently a *Myſtery* to us.

Hath not God Revealed to us in *Scripture* the *Spirituality* of his own Nature? That *he is a Spirit* and therefore will *be worſhipp'd in Spirit and in Truth*; For, that is a true Reaſon why Spiritual Worſhip ſhould be moſt agreeable to him. Now, if we could have a clear, diſtinct poſitive Notion in our minds of God's Spiritual Nature, we might then pretend that there is nothing *myſterious* in this, ſince it is revealed. S. Jo. 4. 24.

But let ſuch Men Examin their own thoughts about this matter; and try, whether the utmoſt they can attain to, be not ſomething *Negative*, viz.

becauſe great Abſurdities would follow if we attributed any thing *Corporeal* to God; for, then he muſt be compounded of Parts, and ſo he may be diſſolved; then he muſt be confined to a certain place, and not every-where preſent; he cannot have the Power of Acting and Self-Determining which a meer Body hath not. For the cleareſt Notion we can have of *Body*, is, that it is made up of ſome things as parts of it, which may be ſeparated from each other, and is confined to a certain place, and hath no Power to Move or Act from it ſelf. But ſome of theſe Men who cry down *Myſteries* and magnifie Reaſon, to ſhew how ſlender their pretences to Reaſon are, have aſſerted a *Corporeal God*, with *Shape* and *Figure*. It was indeed well thought of by thoſe who would make a *Man* to be *God*, to bring *God* down as near to *Man* as might be. But how to Reconcile the Notion of a Body with Infinite Perfections, is a *Myſtery* to me, and far above my Comprehenſion. But if it be no *Myſtery* to ſuch Men, they muſt either deny God's Infinite Perfections or ſhew how a bodily Shape can be capable of them. But ſome Men can confound *Finite* and *Infinite*, *Body* and *Spirit*, *God* and *Man*, and yet are for no *Myſteries*; whereas theſe things are farther from our Reach and Comprehenſion, than any of thoſe Doctrines which they find fault with. But to proceed.

If

If we believe *Prophesie*, we must believe *God's fore-knowledge of future Events*: For, how could they be fore-told if he did not fore-know them? And if he did fore-know those which he did fore-tell, then it was either because those only were revealed to him which is inconsistent with the Divine Perfections; or that he doth fore-know all other Events and only thought fitting to Reveal these: But how can they Solve the Difficulties about *Divine Prescience*? Is there no *Mystery* in this? Nothing above their Comprehension? What then made their great Master deny it, as a thing above his Comprehension? Because nothing can be fore-known but what hath a certain Cause, and therefore, if evil Actions be fore-told God must be the Cause of them, and Men will not be free Agents in them. And yet it is most certain, that the Sufferings of Christ by the Wickedness of Men, were fore-told. What then? Must we make God the Author of Sin? God forbid. Will the righteous Judge of all the Earth, punish Mankind for his own Acts, which they could not avoid? Then we must yield, that there is something in the manner of the *Divine Prescience*, which is above our Comprehension. And the most Searching and Inquisitive Men have been forc'd to yield it at last, as to the Connection between the Certainty of Prescience and the Liberty of human Actions. Is it not then much

Socin. Præl. c. 11.

better

better to ſit down quietly at firſt, Adoring the Infiniteneſs of God's incomprehenſible Perfections, than after all the huffings and diſputings of Men to ſay, *In Ignorantiâ ſola quietem invenio*, as the great Schoolman did? Surely then, here is ſomething plainly revealed, and yet the manner of it is ſtill a *Myſtery* to us.

Cajetan. in 1. q. 22. art. 4.

I ſhall not now inſiſt on any more of the particular Attributes of God, but only in general I deſire to know, whether they believe them to be *Finite* or *Infinite*? If to be *Finite*, then they muſt have certain bounds and limits which they cannot exceed; and that muſt either be from the Imperfection of Nature, or from a Superiour Cauſe, both which are repugnant to the very Being of God. If they believe them to be *Infinite*, how can they comprehend them? We are ſtrangely puzzled in plain, ordinary, finite things; but it is madneſs to pretend to comprehend what is *Infinite*; and yet if the Perfections of God be not *Infinite* they cannot belong to Him.

I ſhall only add, in Conſequence to this Aſſertion, *That if nothing is to be believed, but what may be comprehended*, the very *Being of God* muſt be rejected too. And therefore I deſire all ſuch who talk ſo warmly againſt any *Myſteries in Religion* to conſider whoſe Work it is they are doing; even theirs who under this pretence go about to overthrow all Religion.

Religion. "For, ſay they, *Religion* is a *Myſtery* "in its own Nature; not this or that, or the other "Religion; but *they are all alike*, all is *Myſtery*; "and that is but another Name for *Fraud* and *Im-* "*poſture*. What were the *Heathen Myſteries* but "tricks of *Prieſt-Craft*; and ſuch are maintained "and kept up in all kinds of Religion. If there- "fore theſe men, who talk againſt *Myſteries* under- "ſtand themſelves, they muſt in purſuance of their "Principles reject *one God*, as well as *three Perſons*; "For, as long as they believe an Infinite and In- "comprehenſible Being, it is Nonſenſe to reject "any other Doctrine, which relates to an *Infinite* "*Being*, becauſe it is *Incomprehenſible*.

But yet theſe very Men, who ſeem to purſue the Conſequence of this Principle to the utmoſt, muſt aſſert ſomething more incomprehenſible than the *Being of God*. For, I appeal to any man of common Underſtanding, whether it be not more agreeable to Reaſon to ſuppoſe Works of Skill, Beauty and Order to be the Effects of a Wiſe and Intelligent Being, than of Blind Chance and Unaccountable Neceſſity; whether it be not more agreeable to the Senſe of Mankind to ſuppoſe an Infinite and Eternal Mind endued with all poſſible Perfections to be the Maker of this viſible World; than, that it ſhould ſtart out from it ſelf, without Contrivance, without Order, without Cauſe? Certainly ſuch

men have no Reaſon to find fault with the *Myſteries of Religion* becauſe they are *incomprehenſible*, ſince there is nothing ſo Abſurd and Incomprehenſible, as their darling *Hypotheſis*; And, there is nothing which can make it prevail, but to ſuppoſe Mankind to be as Dull and Inſenſible as the firſt *Chaos*.

Thus I have ſhewn that it is not unreaſonable for *God* to require from us the Belief of ſomething which we cannot comprehend.

(2.) I now come to conſider, whether thoſe who are ſo afraid of *incomprehenſible Myſteries* in our *Faith*, have made it ſo much more eaſie in the Way they have taken. And notwithſtanding all the Hectoring talk againſt *Myſteries* and things incomprehenſible in Religion, I find more inſuperable Difficulties in point of Reaſon in their Way than in ours. As for inſtance,

(1.) It is a more Reaſonable thing to ſuppoſe ſomething *Myſterious* in the Eternal Son of God's *being with the Father before the World was made by him*; (as S. *John* expreſſes it in the beginning of his Goſpel) than in ſuppoſing that although *John* the *Baptiſt* were born ſix Months before *Jeſus Chriſt*; that yet Chriſt was in Dignity before him. What a wonderfull *Myſtery* is this? Can Men have the Face to cry down *Myſteries* in deep Speculations, and matters of a high and abſtruſe Nature, when they make ſuch *Myſteries* of plain and eaſie things?

And

And ſuppoſe the *Evangeliſt* in profound Language and lofty Expreſſions to prove a thing, which was never diſputed, *viz.* that although *Chriſt Jeſus* were born ſix Months after *John*, yet he was in Dignity before him? Yet this was a *Myſtery*, which, as I remember, *Fauſtus Socinus* glories in that his Uncle *Lælius* obtained by Revelation.

(2.) It is a more Reaſonable thing to ſuppoſe that a *Divine Perſon* ſhould aſſume human Nature, and ſo the *Word to be made Fleſh*; than to ſay, that an Attribute of God, his *Wiſdom* or *Power* is *made Fleſh*, which is a *Myſtery* beyond all Comprehenſion; There may be ſome Difficulties in our Conception of the other, but this is a thing beyond all Conception or Imagination; For an *Accident* to be made a *Subſtance* is as abſurd, as to imagin it to *ſubſiſt* without one.

(3.) It is more Reaſonable to ſuppoſe that the Son of God ſhould *come down from Heaven* and take our Nature upon him, than that a man ſhould be rapt up into Heaven, that it might be ſaid that he came down from thence. For in the former Suppoſition we have many other places of Scripture to ſupport it, which ſpeak of his *being with God*, and *having Glory with him before the World was*; whereas there is nothing for the other, but only that it is neceſſary to make ſome tolerable Senſe of thoſe words.

(4.) It is more Reasonable to believe that *God* should become *Man* by taking our Nature upon him; than that *Man* should become *God*. For in the former, there is nothing but the Difficulty of conceiving the Manner of the Union, which we all grant to be so between Soul and Body; but in the other there is a Repugnancy in the very Conception of a *Created God*, of an *Eternal Son of Adam*, of *Omnipotent Infirmity*, of an *Infinite finite Being*. In the former Case, an *Infinite* is united to a *Finite*; but in the other a *Finite* becomes *Infinite*.

(5.) It is more Reasonable to believe that *Christ Jesus* should suffer as he did *for our sakes* than *for his own*. We are all agreed that the *Sufferings* of *Christ* were far beyond any thing he deserved at *God*'s hands; but what Account then is to be given of them? We say that he made himself a voluntary Sacrifice for Expiation of the Sins of Mankind; and so there was a great and noble End designed, and no Injury done to a willing Mind; and the *Scripture* as plainly expresses this, as it can do in Words. But others deny this, and make him to suffer as one wholly Innocent; for what Cause? To make the most Innocent Persons as apprehensive of Suffering as the most Guilty; and the most righteous God to put no difference between them, with Respect to Suffering?

(6.) It is more Reasonable to suppose such a Condescension in the Son of *God* to take upon him the

Form

Form of a Servant for our Advantage; than that a *meer Man* ſhould be Exalted to the *Honour* and *Worſhip* which belongs only *to God.* For, on the one ſide, there is nothing but what is agreeable to the Divine Nature, viz. *Infinite Love* and *Condeſcenſion* and *Pity* to Mankind; on the other, there is the greateſt Deſign of *Self-Exaltation* that ever was in *Human Nature,* viz. for a *meer Man* to have the moſt *Eſſential Attributes* and *Incommunicable Honour* which belongs to *God.* And whether of theſe two is more agreeable to the Spirit and Deſign of the New Teſtament, let any man of underſtanding judge. For as it is evident, that the great Intention of it is to magnifie the wonderfull Love of God in the ſending of his Son; ſo it is as plain that one great End of the Chriſtian Doctrine was to take Mankind off from giving Divine Worſhip to Creatures; and can we then ſuppoſe that at the ſame time it ſhould ſet up the *Worſhip* of a *meer Man* with all the *Honour* and *Adoration* which belongs to *God?* This is to me an *incomprehenſible Myſtery* indeed, and far beyond all that is implied in the *Myſteries* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation.* For it Subverts the very Foundation of the Deſign of Chriſtianity as to the Reforming *Idolatry* then in being; it lays the Foundation for introducing it into the World again; for ſince the Diſtance between God and his Creatures is taken away, in the matter of Worſhip, there is

to nothing

nothing left but the Declaration of his Will; which doth not exclude more *Mediators* of *Interceſſion* but upon this Ground, that the *Mediation* of *Redemption* is the Foundation of that of *Interceſſion*. And it is far more eaſie for us to ſuppoſe there may be ſome things too hard for us to underſtand in the Myſtery of our *Redemption by Jeſus Chriſt*, than that at the ſame time it ſhould be both *a Duty* and *a Sin* to worſhip any but the *true God* with proper Divine Worſhip. For if it be Idolatry to give it to a Creature, then it is a great Sin; for ſo the Scripture ſtill accounts it; but if we are bound to give it to Chriſt who is but a Creature, then that which in it ſelf is a Sin, is now become a Neceſſary Duty; which overthrows the Natural Differences of Good and Evil, and makes *Idolatry* to be a meer *Arbitrary* thing. And I take it for granted, that in Matters of Religion, *Moral* Difficulties are more to be regarded than *Intellectual*; becauſe Religion was far more deſigned for a Rule of our Actions, than for the Satisfaction of our Curioſity. And upon due Examination we ſhall find that there is no ſuch frightfull Appearances of Difficulties in the *Myſtery* of the *Incarnation*, as there is in giving *Divine Worſhip* to a *Creature*.

And it ought to be obſerved, that thoſe very Places which are ſuppoſed to exclude Chriſt from being the *true God*; muſt, if they have any force, exclude him from *Divine Worſhip*. For they are ſpoken

S. Jo. 17. 3.
1 Cor. 6. 6.

of

of God as the *Object* of our *Worſhip*; but if he be not excluded from *Divine Worſhip*, then neither is he from being the *true God*; which they grant he is *by Office* but not *by Nature*.

Socin. ad *Eutrop.* p. 96. *c. Wiek.* c. 11. *Catech. Racov.* p. 65.

But a *God by Office* who is not ſo *by Nature* is a new and *incomprehenſible Myſtery*. A *Myſtery hidden from Ages and Generations* as to the Church of God; but not *made known by the Goſpel of his Son*.

This is ſuch a kind of *Myſtery* as the *Heathen* Prieſts had, who had *Gods many and Lords many*, as the *Apoſtle* ſaith, *i. e.* many *by Office* although but one *by Nature*. But if the Chriſtian Religion had owned *one God by Nature* and only *one by Office*, the Heathens had been to blame chiefly in the Number of their Gods by *Office*, and not in the divine Worſhip which they gave to them. But S. *Paul* blames the Heathens for *doing Service to them which by Nature are no Gods*; not for doing it without Divine Authority, nor for miſtaking the Perſon who was God by Office, but in giving Divine Worſhip to them who *by Nature were no Gods*; which he would never have ſaid, if by the Chriſtian Doctrine, Divine Worſhip were to be given to one who was not *God by Nature*.

1 Cor. 8. 5.

Gal. 4. 8.

But theſe are indeed *incomprehenſible Myſteries* how a Man by Nature can be a God *really* and *truely* by *Office*; how the Incommunicable Perfections of the Divine Nature can be communicated

to

to a Creature; how God ſhould *give his Glory to another*, and by his own Command require that to be given to a Creature, which himſelf had abſolutely forbidden to be given to any beſides himſelf. It is ſaid by a famous *Jeſuit* (I will not ſay how agreeably to their own *Doctrines* and *Practices* about Divine Worſhip) *that the Command of God cannot make him worthy of Divine Worſhip, who without ſuch a Command is not worthy of it. And it is very abſurd to ſay, that he that is unworthy of it without a Command, can become worthy by it; for it makes God to command Divine Honour to be given to one who cannot deſerve it.* (For no meer Man can deſerve to be made God.) *But it is more agreeable to the Divine Nature and Will not to give his Honour to a Creature.*

Smiglec. de Divin. Verb. Incarn. Nat. p. 45.

Nova Monſtra, &c. p. 42.

(3.) But after all the Invectives of theſe Enemies to *Myſteries*, we do not make that which we ſay is *Incomprehenſible* to be a *Neceſſary Article of Faith* as it is *Incomprehenſible*; but we do aſſert that what is *Incomprehenſible* as to the *Manner*, may be a *Neceſſary Article* as far as it is plainly Revealed. As in the Inſtances I have already mentioned of the *Creation* and *Reſurrection of the Dead*; would they in earneſt have Men turn *Infidels* as to theſe things till they are able to comprehend all the difficulties which relate to them? If not, why ſhould this ſuggeſtion be allow'd as to the *Myſteries* which relate to our *Redemption* by *Jeſus Chriſt*? If it be ſaid, *the Caſe is*

not

not alike for those are clearly Revealed and these are not; this brings it to the true and proper Issue of this matter, and if we do not prove a *clear Revelation*, we do not assert their being *Necessary Articles of Faith*; but my present business was only to take off this Objection that the *Mysteries* were Incomprehensible and therefore not to be received by us.

II. And so I come to the second Way, by which, we are to Examin the several Senses of *Christ Jesus coming to save Sinners*: Which of them tends more to the Benefit and Advantage of Mankind; or which is *more worthy of all Acceptation*.

And that will appear by considering these things;

(1.) Which tends most to the raising our *Esteem* and *Love* of *Christ Jesus*.

(2.) Which tends most to the begetting in us a greater *Hatred of Sin*.

(3.) Which tends most to the strengthening our *Hope* of *Salvation by Jesus Christ*.

(1.) As to the raising in us a greater *Esteem* and *Love of Christ*. We are certain that the Infinite Love and Condescension of *Christ Jesus* in undertaking such a Work as *the saving of Sinners* makes it most worthy of all Acceptation. Some Men may please themselves in thinking that by taking away all *Mysteries* they have made their *Faith* more

eaſie, but I am certain they have extremely leſſen'd the Argument for our *Love*, *viz.* the Apprehenſions of the wonderfull Love and Condeſcenſion of Chriſt in coming into the World *to ſave Sinners*. And yet this is the great Argument of the New Teſtament to perſwade Mankind to the *Love of God* and of his Son: *God ſo loved the World that he gave his only begotten Son*, &c. This is indeed a mighty Argument of Love, if by *the only begotten Son* be meant the Eternal Son of God, *who came down from Heaven*, as S. *John* ſpeaks juſt before; but if no more be meant but only that God made a *meer Man* to be his Son, and after he had preached a while here on Earth and was ill uſed and crucified by his own People, he Exalted him to be *God* and gave him Divine Attributes and Honours; this were an Argument of great Love to the Perſon of Chriſt, but not to the reſt of Mankind. But *God's Love* in *Scripture* is magnified with Reſpect to *the World* in the ſending of his Son. *In this was manifeſted*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *the Love of God towards us, becauſe that God ſent his only begotten Son into the World that we ſhould live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and ſent his Son to be a Propitiation for our Sins.* The great Love we ſtill ſee is *towards us*, *i. e.* towards Mankind, but according to the other Senſe it muſt have been, Herein was the Love of God manifeſted to his Son, that for his

Joh. 3. 16.

v. 13.

1 Joh. 4. 9.

v. 10.

Suffering

Sufferings he exalted him above all Creatures. *He that ſpared not his own Son*, ſaith S. *Paul*, *but deliver'd him up for us all.* Rom. 8. 32. If he were the *Eternal Son of God* who came to ſuffer for us, there is a mighty force and *Emphaſis* in this Expreſſion, and very apt to raiſe our Admiration and our Love; But what *not ſparing his own Son* is there, if nothing were meant but that he deſigned by Sufferings to Exalt him? For *not Sparing him* ſuppoſes an Antecedent Relation of the higheſt Kindneſs, but the other is only deſigning extraordinary Kindneſs for the ſake of his Sufferings. Therefore, the Argument for the *Love* of *God* is taken from what his *Son* was, when he deliver'd him up for us all; he was his *own Son*; not by *Adoption* as others are; S. *John* calls him, his *only begotten Son*; and God himſelf, *his beloved Son* in the Voice from Heaven; and this before his Sufferings, immediately after his Baptiſm, when as yet, there was nothing extraordinary done by him, as to the great Deſign of his coming. Which ſhews, that there was an Antecedent Relation between him and the Father; and that therein the Love of God and of Chriſt was manifeſted, that being the *only begotten Son of the Father*, he ſhould take our Nature upon him and for our ſakes do and ſuffer what he did. This is indeed an Argument great enough to raiſe our Admiration, to excite our Devotion, to inflame our Affections; but how flat John 1. 14. ch. 3. v. 16. Luk. 3. 22.

and low doth it appear, when it comes to no more than this, that there was a *Man*, whom, after his Sufferings, *God* raiſed from the dead and made him a *God by Office*? Doth this carry any ſuch Argument in it for our Eſteem and Love and Devotion to him as the other doth upon the moſt ſerious Conſideration of it?

(2.) Which tends moſt to beget in us a greater *Hatred of Sin*. For that is ſo contrary to the Way of our *Salvation* by *Jeſus Chriſt*, that what tends moſt to our *Hatred* of it, muſt conduce moſt to our Happineſs; and therefore be *moſt worthy of all Acceptation*. It is agreed on all hands, that *Chriſt* did ſuffer very much both in his Mind and in his Body. In his Mind; when it is ſaid, *that he was troubled in Spirit*; that *he began to be ſorrowfull and very heavy*; and ſoon after, *My Soul is exceeding ſorrowfull, even unto death*. S. *Luke* ſaith, *that he was in an Agony*; wherein he not only *prayed more earneſtly, but his ſweat was as it were great Drops of Blood falling to the Ground*. What made this Amazement, and dreadfull Agony in the mind of the moſt innocent Perſon in the World? Was it meerly the Fear of the Pains of Death which he was to undergo? That is impoſſible, conſidering the Aſſurance which he had of ſo glorious a Reward ſo ſoon following after; when ſo many Martyrs endured ſuch exquiſite

Joh. 13. 21. Matt. 26. 37, 38.

Mark 14. 33, 34. Luk. 22. 44

Torments

Torments for his ſake without any ſuch Diſturbance or Conſternation. But the Apoſtles give us another Account of it. S. *Peter* ſaith, He was *to bear our Sins in his own body on the tree*; that *Chriſt ſuffer'd for Sins, the juſt for the unjuſt.* S. *Paul*, that *God made him to be Sin for us who knew no Sin, that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him.* Hereby we underſtand how ſo innocent a Perſon came to ſuffer; *he ſtood in our Stead*; *he was made Sin for us*; and therefore was to be treated as a Sinner; and to ſuffer that on our Account, which he could not deſerve on his own. If he ſuffer'd on his own Account, this were the way to fill our Minds with perplexity concerning the Juſtice of Providence with Reſpect to his dealings with the moſt innocent and holy Perſons in this World; If he ſuffer'd on our Account, then we have the Benefit of his Sufferings, and therein we ſee how diſpleaſing to God ſin is, when even his own Son ſuffer'd ſo much by taking the guilt of our Sins upon him. And what can tend more to the begetting in us a due hatred of ſin, than to conſider, what *Chriſt* himſelf ſuffer'd on the Account of it? What can make us have more dreadfull thoughts of it, than that the great and mercifull God, when he deſigned *to Save ſinners*, yet would have his own Son to become *a Propitiation for the Sins of Mankind*? And unleſs we ab-

1 Pet. 2. 24. 3. 18. 2 Cor. 5. 21.

low

low this, we must put force upon the plainest Expressions of *Scripture*; and make *Christ* to suffer meerly to shew God's Power over a most innocent Person, and his Will and Pleasure to inflict the most severe Punishment without any Respect to Guilt. And surely such a Notion of *God*, cannot be *worthy of all Acceptation.*

(3.) Which tends most to strengthen our *Hope* of *Salvation by Christ Jesus.* If we believe that he suffer'd for our Sins, then we have great Reason to hope for the Forgiveness of them; although they have been many and great, if we sincerely Repent; because the most prevailing Argument for Despair will be removed; which is taken from the *Justice of God*, and his declared *Hatred* of *Sin* and *Displeasure* against *Sinners.* If God be so much in earnest displeased with the Sins of Mankind, and his Justice be concerned in the Punishment of Sinners, how can they ever hope to escape, unless there be a way for his Displeasure to be removed, and his Justice to be satisfied? And this the *Scripture* tells us is done by *Christ*, who died that he might be a *Sacrifice of Atonement* to *Reconcile us to God by his Death*; as S. *Paul* expressly affirms. And by this means, we may have strong Consolation from the Hopes of Forgiveness of our Sins. Whereas, if this be taken away, either Men must believe that *God* was not in

Rom. 5. 10.
2 Cor. 5. 19.
Heb. 9. 15

earnest

earneſt diſpleaſed with the Sins of Mankind; which muſt exceedingly leſſen our Eſteem of the *Holineſs* and *Juſtice of God*; or if he were ſo diſpleaſed, that he laid aſide this Diſpleaſure, without any *Atonement* or *Sacrifice* of *Expiation*. And ſo, as many as look on *God's Juſtice* and *Holineſs* as neceſſary and eſſential Attributes of God, will be in danger of ſinking into the Depths of Deſpair, as often as they Reflect ſeriouſly on the Guilt of their Sins. But on the other ſide, if we believe that while we were *Enemies*, *we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son*; then we may *have Peace with God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; and have Reaſon to believe that there will be *no Condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus* by a lively Faith and ſincere Repentance; then they may with Comfort look up to God as a Reconciled Father, through *Jeſus Chriſt our Mediator*; then they may with inward Satisfaction look beyond the Grave, and ſtedfaſtly hope for that Salvation which Chriſt purchaſed on Earth and will at laſt beſtow on all ſuch as Love and Obey him. To which God of his Infinite Mercy bring us all through *Jeſus Chriſt*. For, *This is a faithfull Saying and worthy of all Acceptation, that he came into the World to ſave Sinners.*

FINIS.

Lately Printed for Henry Mortlock *at the* Phœnix *in St. Paul's Church-Yard.*

A Sermon Preached before the Queen at *White-Hall*, *Febr.* 22. 168$\frac{8}{9}$. upon 1 *Pet.* 14. verse 18.

A Sermon Preached before the King and Queen at *White-Hall*, *March* the 23d. 168$\frac{8}{9}$. upon *Ecclesiastes* 11. verse 9.

Christian Magnanimity: A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church at *Worcester*, at the Time of the Assizes, *September* 21. 1690. upon 2 *Tim.* 1. verse 7.

A Sermon Preached before the Queen at *White-Hall*, *March* the 1*st*. 169$\frac{0}{1}$. on *Luke* 6. v. 46. All Four by the Right Reverend Father in God, *Edward* Lord Bishop of *Worcester*.

The Bishop of *Worcester*'s Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese, in his Primary Visitation, begun at *Worcester*, *Septemb.* 11. 1690. Quarto.